



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,588	04/07/2005	David A. Blaker	026032-4851	7635

26371 7590 12/09/2008  
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
777 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE  
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5306

EXAMINER
----------

JIANG, YONG HANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/09/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/530,588	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BLAKER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> YONG HANG JIANG	<b>Art Unit</b> 2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 32-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 32-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment filed on 9/16/2008 has been entered. Claims 1-31 are cancelled. Claims 32-55 are newly added and pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 32-55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 41 is objected to because of the following informalities: the limitation "a third wireless control signal" is present on line 2, but no second wireless control signal is ever mentioned. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claim 49, no proper support has been found in the specification originally filed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by King et al. (US 6,271,765).

Regarding claim 47, King discloses a wireless control apparatus in a vehicle, comprising; a control circuit configured with an operating mode (via processor 26 in transmitter system 20, See Figure 1 and Col. 2, lines 36-41); an operator input device coupled to the control circuit and including at least one input actuation device (via user interface 28 including switches 32A-C, See figure 1 and Col. 3, lines 5-13); an interface circuit coupled to the control circuit and configured to receive navigation data from at least one navigation data source (via sensor 30 determines the position of the transmitter system 20 relative to earth); a transmitter circuit coupled to the control circuit and configured to transmit wireless control signals having control data (via GDO transmitter 22 on transmitter system 20 transmits a signal associated with one of the receivers 42A-C, See Col. 1, lines 50-52 and Col. 2, lines 36-41); and a memory coupled to the control circuit configured to store a first data pair (via memory 27A storing a plurality of locations indicated by the sensor 30 and associated with the user

Art Unit: 2612

input device 32A, See Col. 2, lines 9-16 and Col. 3, lines 5-13), wherein the first data pair includes a first location corresponding to a first electronic system and first information for generating a first wireless control signal for actuating the first electronic system (via memory 32A storing a first location and wireless control signal relative to first receiver 42A, See Col. 2, lines 17-29); wherein in operating mode the control circuit is configured to determine a current location of the wireless control apparatus, to compare the determined current location with at least one location stored in memory in response to actuation of the at least one input actuation device, and to cause the transmitter to transmit the first wireless control signal if the current location of the wireless control apparatus is most proximate to the first location (via transmitter system 20 determines that its position relative to earth is within a predetermined distance, See Col. 2, lines 36-45).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 2612

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 32-33, 39-40, 42-43, 53, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. (US 6,271,765), and further in view of Dykema et al. (US 6,091,343).

Regarding claim 32, King et al disclose a wireless control apparatus in a vehicle and method of actuating a remote electronic system, comprising:

a control circuit configured with a training mode (via processor 26 in transmitter system 20 configured with a learning mode, See Figure 1 and Col. 3, lines 5-7);

an operator input device coupled to the control circuit and including at least one input actuation device (via user input devices 32, See Col. 3, lines 41-44);

an interface circuit coupled to the control circuit and configured to transmit wireless control signals having control data (via transmitter 22, Col.1, lines 51-56); and

a memory coupled to the control circuit (via storage 27A-C, See Col. 2, lines 9-17);

wherein upon entering the training mode the control circuit is configured to determine a first location corresponding to a first remote electronic system, and to store the first location as a first data in the memory (via storing the location of gate 44A in the learning mode, See Col. 3, lines 5-13).

King further discloses in operating mode the control circuit is configured to determine a current location of the wireless control system, to compare the determined

Art Unit: 2612

current location with at least one location stored in memory, and to transmit a wireless control signal if the current location of the wireless control system is most proximate to the a location (via transmitter system 20 determines that its position relative to earth is within a predetermined distance, See Col. 2, lines 36-45).

But King did not specifically disclose the training mode further comprises detecting a first wireless control signal for actuating the first remote electronic system, and to store first information regarding the first wireless control signal and the first location as a first data pair in the memory and wherein the control circuit and transmitter circuit generate the wireless control signal based on the stored information regarding the wireless control signal.

Dykema teaches a trainable RF transmitter having expanded learning capabilities to learn codes to operate remotely actuated systems. The trainable transmitter has multiple channels to learn and store characteristics of a received RF signal transmitted from an original transmitter associated with a remotely actuated device; the stored RF signals allow the trainable transmitter the ability to actuate multiple remotely actuated systems. (See Col. 5, lines 49-58; and Col. 3, lines 17-21)

From the teachings of Dykema, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus disclosed by King to include the training mode further comprises detecting a first wireless control signal for actuating the first remote electronic system, and to store first information regarding the first wireless control signal and the first location as a first data pair in the memory and wherein the control circuit and transmitter circuit generate the wireless

Art Unit: 2612

control signal based on the stored information regarding the wireless control signal as taught by Dykema to learn and store RF signals to remotely actuate multiple systems, thereby expanding the capability of the apparatus.

Regarding claim 33, the combination of King and Dykema discloses the claimed invention wherein Dykema discloses a receiver circuit coupled to the control circuit (via receiving antenna coupled to mixer 136), wherein in training mode the control circuit detects the first wireless control signal by receiving the first wireless control signal via the receiver circuit. (See figures 5 and 6; and Col. 5, lines 59-65)

Regarding claim 39, Dykema discloses the detected first wireless control signal for actuating the first remote electronic system has not been previously detected by the wireless control system (via the detected first wireless control signal from original transmitter, See Col. 5, lines 49-58).

Regarding claims 40, 53, and 54, King et al disclose a wireless control apparatus in a vehicle and method of actuating a remote electronic system, comprising:

- a control circuit configured with a training mode (via processor 26 in transmitter system 20 configured with a learning mode, See Figure 1 and Col. 3, lines 5-7);

- an operator input device coupled to the control circuit and including at least one input actuation device (via user input devices 32, See Col. 3, lines 41-44);

- an interface circuit coupled to the control circuit and configured to transmit wireless control signals having control data (via transmitter 22, Col.1, lines 51-56); and

- a memory coupled to the control circuit (via storage 27A-C, See Col. 2, lines 9-17);



wherein upon entering the training mode the control circuit is configured to determine a first location corresponding to a first remote electronic system, and to store the first location as a first data in the memory (via storing the location of gate 44A in the learning mode, See Col. 3, lines 5-13).

But King did not specifically disclose the training mode further comprises detecting a first wireless control signal for actuating the first remote electronic system, and to store first information regarding the first wireless control signal and the first location as a first data pair in the memory.

Dykema teaches a trainable RF transmitter having expanded learning capabilities to learn codes to operate remotely actuated systems. The trainable transmitter has multiple channels to learn and store characteristics of a received RF signal transmitted from an original transmitter associated with a remotely actuated device; the stored RF signals allow the trainable transmitter the ability to actuate multiple remotely actuated systems. (See Col. 5, lines 49-58; and Col. 3, lines 17-21)

From the teachings of Dykema, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus disclosed by King to include the training mode further comprises detecting a first wireless control signal for actuating the first remote electronic system, and to store first information regarding the first wireless control signal and the first location as a first data pair in the memory as taught by Dykema to learn and store RF signals to remotely actuate multiple systems, thereby expanding the capability of the apparatus.

Regarding claim 42, the combination of King and Dykema discloses the claimed invention, wherein King discloses the wireless control device enters a training mode before detecting the first wireless control signal (via activating user input device 34 to place the transmitter system 20 in learning mode, See Col. 3, lines 5-13).

Regarding claim 43, the combination of King and Dykema discloses the claimed invention, wherein King discloses entering a training mode is initiated via the operator input device coupled to the wireless control apparatus (via activating user input device 34 to place the transmitter system 20 in learning mode, See Col. 3, lines 5-13).

10. Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. in view of Dykema as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Hamid et al. (US 6,877,097).

Regarding claims 34 and 35, King did not specifically disclose the input actuation device includes a biometric input device including fingerprint scan device.

Hamid teaches a security access method and apparatus, the apparatus includes a biometric sensor such that a biometric characteristic of a person for example a finger pattern is read to see if the person is authorized to access the secure device or service. (See the Abstract).

From the teachings of Hamid, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify apparatus of King to include he input actuation device includes a biometric input device being a finger print scanner as taught by Hamid to use the biometric input device to determine if the operator is authorized to access the apparatus.

Art Unit: 2612

11. Claims 36-38, 41 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. in view of Dykema et al. as applied to claims 32, 40, or 54, and further in view of Suman et al. (US 5,793,300).

Regarding claims 36-37, 41, and 55, the combination of King and Dykema did not specifically disclose while in the training mode the control circuit is configured to further detect a third wireless control signal for actuating a second remote electronic system at the first location, and to store a second information regarding the third wireless control signal and the first location corresponding to the second remote electronic system as a second data pair in the memory.

Suman teaches a trainable RF receiver for remotely controlling household appliances. The house hold appliances include a garage door opener and lights inside the garage. A trainable transmitter is used to send a first control signals to actuate the garage door and a second control signal to turn on/off the lights. (See the Abstract and Col. 3, line 51 to Col. 4, line 8; Col. 8, lines 46-62)

From the teachings of Suman, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of King and Dykema to include while in the training mode the control circuit is configured to further detect a third wireless control signal for actuating a second remote electronic system at the first location, and to store a second information regarding the third wireless control signal and the first location corresponding to the second remote electronic system as a second data pair in the memory in order to actuate a second remotely control system

Art Unit: 2612

such as lights in the garage door using the apparatus, thereby making the apparatus more convenient.

Regarding claim 38, the combination of King, Dykema, Suman did not specifically disclose the control circuit is configured to transmit the fourth wireless control signal a predetermined time after the second wireless control signal is transmitted.

However, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of King, Dykema, and Suman to include the control circuit is configured to transmit the fourth wireless control signal a predetermined time after the second wireless control signal is transmitted in order to avoid interference from transmitting two different signals consecutively.

12. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. in view of Dykema et al. as applied to claim 40, and further in view of Oliver et al. (US 6,580,838).

Regarding claim 44, the combination of King and Dykema did not specifically disclose the wireless control apparatus automatically enters the training mode after detecting the first wireless control signal.

Oliver teaches a device (100) programmed to automatically enter a learning mode upon detection of a new command, when a new command given by a user is detected by the device, the device automatically stores the new command without the need to use any buttons to activate the learning mode. (See the Abstract and Col. 9, lines 39-59)

From the teachings of Oliver, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of King and Dykema to include the wireless control apparatus automatically enters the training mode after detecting the first wireless control signal as taught by Oliver to program the wireless control apparatus to automatically store newly detected wireless control signals without the use of buttons to enter the training mode, thereby making the wireless control apparatus more convenient.

13. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. in view of Dykema et al. and Oliver et al. as applied to claims 44 and 40, and further in view of Shaheen et al. (US 5,893,920).

Regarding claim 45, the combination of King, Dykema, and Oliver did not specifically disclose the control circuit is configured to prompt a user to select whether to store the first data pair prior to storing the first data pair and to store the first data pair if storing the first data pair is selected.

Shaheen teaches a system that displays a warning message if an action is selected in the system and also prompting the user to confirm the selection. (See Col. 6, lines 24-26).

From the teachings of Shaheen, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of King, Dykema, and Oliver to include the control circuit is configured to prompt a user to select whether to store the first data pair prior to storing the first data pair and to store the first data pair if storing the first data pair is selected as taught by Shaheen to allow the

Art Unit: 2612

operator to confirm storing of the first data pair, thereby avoiding unwanted storage of data pairs.

14. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. in view of Dykema et al., and further in view of Flick (US 6,392,534).

Regarding claim 46, the combination of King and Dykema did not specifically disclose the control circuit is configured to receive an indication from a user as to which of a plurality of detected control signals are to be stored as data pairs with the first location.

Flick teaches a remote control system for a vehicle comprising a means for selection to select a desired set of signals from a plurality of signals. A keypad or other input device may be used to permit the user to select the desired signal set. (See Col. 9, lines 33-58).

From the teachings of Flick, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of King and Dykema to include the control circuit is configured to receive an indication from a user as to which of a plurality of detected control signals are to be stored as data pairs with the first location as taught by Flick to selectively send the signals, thereby providing the user with more control of the wireless control apparatus.

15. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. as applied to claim 47 above., and further in view of Van Horn et al. (US 6,326,889)

Regarding claim 48, King et al did not specifically disclose the control circuit is configured to provide an out of transmission range notification to provide to a user after

Art Unit: 2612

comparing the determined current location with stored locations if the wireless control apparatus is outside a predefined proximity of the first location.

Van Horn et al. teach a transmitter (remote communication device 12) with a control circuit configured to provide an indication if the transmitter is out of range of proper operation. (See the Abstract, Col. 6, lines 52-65; and Col. 9, lines 9-13)

From the teachings of Van Horn et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the transmitter of King et al. to the control circuit is configured to provide an out of transmission range notification to provide to a user after comparing the determined current location with stored locations if the wireless control apparatus is outside a predefined proximity of the first location as taught by Van Horn et al. to notify users of improper operation, thereby saving power.

16. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. in view of Van Horn et al. as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of Shaheen et al. (US 5,893,920).

Regarding claim 49, the combination of King and Van Horn did not specifically disclose the control circuit is configured to prompt the user to select whether to transmit the first wireless control signal after providing the out of range notification and to transmit the first wireless control signal for controlling the first electronic system if the first location is most proximate to the current location and transmitting the first wireless control signal is selected.

Art Unit: 2612

Shaheen teaches a system that displays a warning message if an action is selected in the system and also prompting the user to confirm the selection. (See Col. 6, lines 24-26).

From the teachings of Shaheen, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of King, Dykema, and Oliver to the control circuit is configured to prompt the user to select whether to transmit the first wireless control signal after providing the out of range notification and to transmit the first wireless control signal for controlling the first electronic system if the first location is most proximate to the current location and transmitting the first wireless control signal is selected as taught by Shaheen to allow the operator to confirm the desired action before the action is taken, thereby eliminating unnecessary mistakes.

17. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. as applied to claim 47 above, and further in view of Hamid et al. (US 6,877,097).

Regarding claim 50, King did not specifically disclose the input actuation device includes a biometric input device.

Hamid teaches a security access method and apparatus, the apparatus includes a biometric sensor such that a biometric characteristic of a person for example a finger pattern is read to see if the person is authorized to access the secure device or service. (See the Abstract).

From the teachings of Hamid, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify apparatus of King to include he



Art Unit: 2612

input actuation device includes a biometric input device as taught by Hamid to use the biometric input device to determine if the operator is authorized to access the apparatus.

18. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. as applied to claim 47 above, and further in view of Suman (US 5,793,300).

Regarding claim 51, King did not specifically disclose the first location also corresponds to a second control signal for actuating a second electronic system, further comprising transmitting the second wireless control signal if the first location is most proximate to the current location.

Suman teaches a trainable RF receiver for remotely controlling household appliances. The house hold appliances include a garage door opener and lights inside the garage. A trainable transmitter is used to send a first control signals to actuate the garage door and a second control signal to turn on/off the lights. (See the Abstract and Col. 3, line 51 to Col. 4, line 8; Col. 8, lines 46-62)

From the teachings of Suman, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of King to include the first location also corresponds to a second control signal for actuating a second electronic system, further comprising transmitting the second wireless control signal if the first location is most proximate to the current location in order to actuate a second remotely control system such as lights in the garage door using the apparatus, thereby making the apparatus more convenient.

Art Unit: 2612

19. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. as applied to claim 47 above, and further in view of Suman (US 5,793,300) and Flick (US 6,392,534).

Regarding claim 52, King did not specifically disclose the first location also corresponds to a second control signal for actuating a second electronic system.

Suman teaches a trainable RF receiver for remotely controlling household appliances. The house hold appliances include a garage door opener and lights inside the garage. A trainable transmitter is used to send a first control signals to actuate the garage door and a second control signal to turn on/off the lights. (See the Abstract and Col. 3, line 51 to Col. 4, line 8; Col. 8, lines 46-62)

From the teachings of Suman, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of King to include the first location also corresponds to a second control signal for actuating a second electronic system in order to actuate a second remotely control system such as lights in the garage door using the apparatus, thereby making the apparatus more convenient.

The combination of King and Suman did not specifically disclose the control circuit is configured to prompt a user to select a signal for transmission from a plurality of signals, wherein the plurality of signals includes the first wireless control signal and the second wireless control signal, to receive an indication as to which signal from the plurality of signals to transmit, and to transmit the indicated signal if the first location is most proximate to the current location.

Art Unit: 2612

Flick teaches a remote control system for a vehicle comprising a means for selection to select a desired set of signals from a plurality of signals. A keypad or other input device may be used to permit the user to select the desired signal set. (See Col. 9, lines 33-58).

From the teachings of Flick, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of King and Suman to include the control circuit is configured to prompt a user to select a signal for transmission from a plurality of signals, wherein the plurality of signals includes the first wireless control signal and the second wireless control signal, to receive an indication as to which signal from the plurality of signals to transmit, and to transmit the indicated signal if the first location is most proximate to the current location taught by Flick to selectively send the signals, thereby providing the user with more control of the wireless control apparatus.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YONG HANG JIANG whose telephone number is (571)270-3024. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian A. Zimmerman can be reached on 571-272-3059. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Y. J./

Examiner, Art Unit 2612

/Brian A Zimmerman/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2612